

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-9, and 11-13 are pending. Claims 2, 4, and 11 are amended. Claims 15-17 are canceled by the present amendment. Claims 1, 3, 10, and 14 were canceled previously. Support for the amendments Claims 2, 4, and 11 can be found in now-canceled Claims 15, 16, and 17, respectively, inasmuch as Claims 2, 4, and 11 are amended merely to incorporate the features of a dependent claim. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 2, 4-9, 11-13, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Tonkin (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,568, herein “Tonkin”).

Amended independent Claim 2 recites, in part:

wherein said document supervisory client makes a query to the document supervisory server via a network if the print condition settings are permissible in a printer, said document supervisory server returns advisability of the print condition settings to the document supervisory client,

said document supervisory server changes a combination of the print condition settings and sends a permissible combination including one set of changed print condition settings to the document supervisory client when determining the print condition settings are impermissible,

said document supervisory client generates a user interface based on the one set of changed print condition settings, and

the combination of the print condition settings changed by said document supervisory server is a combination of print condition settings that were set by a user of the printing system.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 2 as anticipated by Tonkin, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response. Amended independent Claim 2 recites that when the print **condition settings entered by a user are impermissible**, the supervisory server changes a combination of the print condition settings entered by the user and sends the permissible combination to the client.

To the extent that Tonkin causes a computer to enter settings, Tonkin does so when settings are left **unspecified** by the user. Tonkin states:

If the user has specified a particular component, the document component object corresponding to that component will include a pointer to a production component object for that particular component. This is generally the case for printed pages and tab pages. **On the other hand, if the user has merely specified a type of a component to be used, the corresponding document component object preferably will merely include a reference to a class or a sub-class of production components.** This will generally be the case for document bindings. **In this regard, it is generally preferable to allow the user to specify a type of binding and allow the software to select a specific binding of that type based on properties, such as thickness, of the final document.** Such a selection process is described below.¹

Thus, the user specifies a particular component or a type of component to be used. The software then selects a specific component such as a specific binding that will work with the component specified by the user to create a complete group of settings by which the document is produced. In other words, Tonkin allows a user to select a general high level setting while leaving selection of unspecified details up to the software. Tonkin indicates that it is **preferable** to allow the user to enter a general high level setting, e.g., the type of binding, and to have the software select the specific details for that general setting, e.g., the specific type of binding.

Although Tonkin states that allowing the software to specify details regarding printing once a user has entered general data is not only **permitted**, it is **preferable**; the outstanding Office Action asserts that when settings are entered with only general information, the settings are "impermissible."² Applicant respectfully submits that the interpretation of impermissible in the outstanding Office Action does not conform to the description of the unentered settings in Tonkin.

¹ Tonkin, col. 9, lines 24-37 (emphasis added), see also Tonkin, col. 9, lines 43-51.

² Outstanding Office Action, page 2.

Applicant respectfully notes that "preferable" unentered settings as described in Tonkin are not "impermissible" settings as recited in amended independent Claim 2.

Thus, Tonkin does not change settings when settings are impermissible. Rather, Tonkin allows a user to select one general setting and then supplies the remaining unentered settings in response to the selected general setting. As discussed in the previous response, if the settings supplied by the user are actually impermissible, Tonkin merely sends an error message to the user and does not change the settings.³

However, in order to further patentably distinguish independent Claim 2 over Tonkin, Claim 2 is amended to recite that the combination of **the print condition settings changed by the second computer is a combination of print condition settings that were set by a user of the printing system.**

The outstanding Office Action asserts that "the combination of the print condition settings changed by said document supervisory server is a combination of a print condition settings that were set by an operator of the printing system," and the outstanding Office Action cites Tonkin, col. 7, lines 28-56 as evidence for this assertion.⁴ However, the cited section of Tonkin states:

Also included in main document editing window 310 are radio buttons 314 for the user to select paper size. Specifically, the user can elect to use the paper size indicated in the source file, in which case the paper size specified in the source file will be detected automatically. Alternatively, the user can select a different paper size, in which case the content automatically will be scaled to fit the selected paper size. Although the present embodiment utilizes only a single paper size, it is noted that the invention is not so limited, and other embodiments of the invention may include more than a single paper size in the document.

Fields 316, 317 and 318 allow a user to specify the side which is to be bound (e.g., left side or top side), the type of binding to use (e.g., coil binder, tape binding, perfect binding), and binding color respectively. Clicking on the arrow associated with each field causes a list of options to be displayed for that field. Thus, for example, a user might select a black coil binder to be placed on the left side of the document.

³ Tonkin, col. 10, lines 23-43.

⁴ Outstanding Office Action, page 6, item 12 referring to now-canceled dependent Claim 15.

Field 320 allows a user to select staple options, such as none, upper left corner, or top center. It should be noted that while stapling is treated differently than binding in the present embodiment of the invention, in other embodiments stapling might be treated as one type of binding. Field 322 allows the user to specify whether and what types of holes are to be drilled in the document. Field 324 allows the user to specify machine folding of the pages. In each case, clicking on the down arrow causes a list of options to be displayed.⁵

Applicant respectfully submits Tonkin does not describe an apparatus changing settings that are entered by a user. The above-noted section indicates that the user can specify particular settings such as "folding of pages." However, nothing in the above-quoted section or anywhere else in Tonkin indicates that a document supervisory server **changes any impermissible settings that were entered by a user.** Rather, as discussed above, Tonkin prefers to allow automatic entry of specific details once a user has entered general high level settings. Automatic entry of unentered settings does not correlate to changing impermissible settings that were entered by a user.

Accordingly, Tonkin fails to teach or suggest a document supervisory client that determines when the print condition settings are impermissible and changes these settings to permissible settings, wherein the combination of the print condition settings changed by the document supervisory server is a combination of print condition settings that were set by a user of the printing system. Thus, amended independent Claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Tonkin for at least the reasons discussed above.

Amended independent Claims 4 and 11 recite substantially similar features to those discussed above regarding amended independent Claim 2. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claims 4 and 11 patentably distinguish over Tonkin for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 2.

Claim 5 depends from amended independent Claim 2, and Claims 6, 7, 8, and 9 depend from amended independent Claim 4. Claims 12 and 13 depend from amended

⁵ Tonkin, col. 7, lines 28-56.

independent Claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, and 13 patentably distinguish over Tonkin for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to Claim 2, 4, and 11 are to place the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal inasmuch as the amendments merely incorporate a dependent claim into each of independent Claims 2, 4, and 11. Accordingly, the amendments should be entered in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b)(2).

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Lee L. Stepina
Registration No. 56,837